

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF ALABAMA  
EASTERN DIVISION

GEORGE D. McCARLEY,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
	)	
v.	)	
	)	CIVIL ACTION NO. 3:06CV91-MEF
HOUSEHOLD FINANCE	)	
CORPORATION III, <i>et al.</i> ,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	

**ORDER ON MOTIONS**

On November 14, 2007, Plaintiff filed six motions: (1) Motion for Permission to file Motion to Compel Creditor Identification (Doc. #102); (2) Motion for Permission to file Motion to Compel Definitions Contained on Billing Terms and Systems (Doc. #103); (3) Motion for Permission to Submit Motion to Compel Suspicious People Investigation (Doc. #104); (4) Motion for Permission to Submit Motion to Extend Period of Witness Identification (Doc. #105); (5) Motion for Permission to file Request to Advise Plaintiff on Court Steps Required to Launch Criminal Investigations (Doc. #106); and (6) Motion for Permission to Submit Motion to Expedite Trial Calendar (Doc. #107). The Court has reviewed each motion and finds that they all lack good cause.

With respect to the first motion, Plaintiff seeks to file a motion to compel Defendants to disclose the identity of five non-party creditors. Plaintiff seeks this information so that he may consider whether to add additional defendants. The

scheduling order in this cause clearly pronounced the deadline for amending the Complaint as April 30, 2007. Plaintiff has failed to show due diligence why he seeks the possibility to amend the Complaint at this late hour. The motion (Doc. #102) is therefore DENIED.

With regard to the second motion (Doc. #103), Plaintiff seeks to file a motion to compel “definitions contained on billing terms and system.” Plaintiff fails to identify which terms he seeks defined by Defendants. Moreover, it appears Plaintiff previously raised this issue in his motion to compel dated September 28, 2007. The motion (Doc. #103) is therefore DENIED with prejudice.

With regard to the third motion (Doc. #104), Plaintiff seeks to file a motion to compel Defendants to engage in an investigation of “suspicious people investigation.” Plaintiff’s motion fails to demonstrate any possible relevancy of this “investigation” to the pending RESPA claim. Moreover, Plaintiff concedes he previously has raised this discovery matter to the Court in his motion to compel dated September 28, 2007, a motion which the Court denied. The Court will not permit Plaintiff to engage in a whimsical fishing expedition. The motion (Doc. #104) is therefore DENIED with prejudice.

With regard to the fourth motion (Doc. #105), Plaintiff seeks leave to file a motion to extend the deadline for identifying witnesses in this case. Plaintiff’s motion, however, fails to provide good cause why the motion should be granted. The motion (Doc. #105) is

therefore DENIED.

With regard to the fifth motion (Doc. #106), Plaintiff seeks to leave to file a motion requesting the Court to advise him how to commence criminal charges against Defendants. The Court previously has informed Plaintiff that it does not act as Plaintiff's advisor or counsel in this matter. The motion (Doc. #106) is therefore DENIED with prejudice.

Last, with regard to the sixth motion (Doc. #107), Plaintiff seeks leave to file a motion to expedite the trial date in this cause. Because Plaintiff has failed to provide good cause for expediting the trial date, the motion (Doc. #107) is DENIED. It is further

**ORDERED that Plaintiff shall file not any additional motions or pleadings in this matter until the Court renders its decision on the pending Motion for Summary Judgment. Plaintiff's failure to comply with this Order may result in sanctions.**

DONE this 14th day of November, 2007.

/s/ Wallace Capel, Jr.  
WALLACE CAPEL, JR.  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE